DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 412 CE 013 425

AUTHOR	Gallagher, Dennis
TITLE	New Prospectus for Youth: Worlds of Education, Work and Service.
INSTITUTION	National Manpower Inst., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 76
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Opportunities; Employment Opportunities; *Government Role; *Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Social Services; Volunteers; *Youth Opportunities; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Public Service

ABSTRACT

There is need for a comprehensive youth policy in this country concerned primarily, not with increasing service to youth, but with enlarging opportunities which are rewarding to them and to society. The major thrusts of such a policy are (1) the continued enlargement of options within education, (2) the recognition of work as a valued option for youth which they, just as adults, have a right to expect to be available, and (3) the development of a national youth service initiative which ties together yet encourages and enlarges on the diversity of efforts that already are underway at the federal, state, and local levels for activity performed for the public welfare as volunteers or at less than the prevailing wage. New processes of cooperation at the local level, which bring together important constituencies and interests around issues of youth development, need to be worked on. At the same time it is essential that federal and state levels demonstrate higher priority concern and commitment toward youth development problems by rewarding those communities who have made the commitment to comprehensive youth development planning and implementation. There is need for implementation of a major full employment bill which would improve the employment environment for adults and youth alike, need for a major federal initiative supporting locally developed community service opportunities for youth, and need to maintain commitment to providing youth with opportunities to pursue education beyond high school. (JT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146412

NEW PROSPECTUS FOR YOUTH: WORLDS OF EDUCATION, WORK AND SERVICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dennis Gallagher
National Manpower Institute
November 1976

CE 013 425

NEW PROSPECTS FOR YOUTH: WORLDS OF EDUCATION, WORK AND SERVICE

Dennis Gallagher
National Manpower Institute
Washington, D. C.

Young people reach physical maturity at an earlier age today than in the recent past; yet, they are being held in "steerage," in a basically dependent status, until they are even older with fewer opportunities to contribute to the development of the society in which they will be spending the rest of their lives.

Youth's influence on society today is significant; but it is principally as consumers and as the recipients of services. Clearly, the energies and egos of young people need to be engaged in producing as well as consuming, in serving as well as being served. Rising levels of educational opportunity need to be balanced with rising levels of opportunity to apply and test the benefits and relevance of that education.

Basically passive, reactive relationships of youth to society must be countered by the emergence of new opportunities within education, work and service which involve youth in their communities. It is not just youth but the entire society which pays heavy penalties for failure to involve youth more fully in designing the future.

Rising levels of youth vandalism and crime, of drug and alcohol abuse are obvious and extremely costly symptoms of youth's alienation. It costs approximately $12,000 per year to keep a youth in a state-run correctional

institution. In excess of $350,000,000 per year are spent nationally on the maintenance and operation of such facilities. This expense, of course, represents only a fraction of the direct costs of dealing with youth crime as it does not include any of the costs associated with apprehending, providing counseling or other youth services, and bringing the youngster to trial.* These figures don't include costs of the physical damage and the loss of property which, if we look only at one piece of the problem, vandalism in the schools, exceeds one-half billion dollars per year. Finally, and most importantly, these figures don't in any way express the human costs in the forms of lost potential and permanently damaged lives.

Another, perhaps less obvious but nevertheless serious indicator of youth's alienation is the extent to which youth are experiencing difficulties making a transition from school-to-work in particular and from youth to adulthood in general. It should not be the norm that access to the economy, at the entry level, be made conditional upon the prior acquisition of narrow, specialized skills. The educational process itself is damaged where it focuses much of its attention on special preparation for the work place. Yet, young people appear to be approaching the world of work at a later age with more training and more degrees but with decreasing confidence that what they have to offer beyond these technical competencies is of value. There is something particularly debilitating about such "trained incapacity." Our society needs the self-confidence not the self-consciousness of youth.

---

* Over 50% of all crime in the U.S. is performed by people under 25 years of age. Therefore, a significant proportion of the billions of dollars that are spent annually on law enforcement must be attributed to this phenomena as well.

We can ill afford, therefore, to continue to isolate youth from participation until they reach ages (and training and socialization levels) where their ideas and ideals conform to the rest of ours. Confronted by a plethora of crises (economic, environmental, ecologic, resource, etc.) new vision is required which isn't likely to evolve unless people, from an early age, are encouraged to perceive and act on new perceptions of social need. It's not that youth can solve the world's or the nation's or the community's problems if provided opportunities to become involved; but, failing encouragement and opportunities for youth to develop and act on a social consciousness and commitment the likelihood that, as adults, they will become creatively engaged in contributing to the resolution of critical societal problems is imperiled.

It may be, for example, that our economy does not require the labor of youth to produce the level and kinds of goods and services to which we have become accustomed. That this may be, in fact, the case is supported by the persistently high rates of youth unemployment. But are these the goods and services we require? Is this the economy we want? *

Our society does require, now probably more than ever, the involvement and commitment of young people in helping the rest of us decide what goods

---

* The economy is the principal mechanism through which the critical concerns and needs of the society are addressed and through which things of value to a society establish their worth. Work is the means whereby the society's human resources are engaged in addressing those concerns and needs and in producing those things for which a value has been established. It seems a legitimate question to ask whether our economy is now operating in such a way as to permit the expression of needs and concerns in forms which are translatable in to value and, consequently, into jobs.

and services the economy should and should not provide, the conditions and circumstances under which they will be provided and the effects (with regards to the environment, resource depletion, etc.) that we are willing to accept as a consequence of producing certain goods and providing certain services. This will not happen if youth are on the sidelines only contemplating and not in the field complicating our lives by contributing to what it is we have to offer as a society.

Certainly, it was the intent of public policy makers to increase the incentives for young people to continue with their educations and to increase the general public's acceptance of the value of education as preparation for participation in adult society. Success in the achievement of this objective has begun to breed its own problems. Today, the balance has shifted too far. Singular emphasis on one form of youth activity in society has caused other activities for youth to wither, go undeveloped or unrecognized.

A Chinese philosopher said, "If you keep going in the same direction, you will reach where it is that you are headed." We are headed on a course where education itself will eventually be devalued because we have failed to put its values and virtues into context with the values and virtues of other forms of participation in society. There are straws in the wind, harbingers of a future of frustration for education's graduates whose training and expectations are out of tune with the nature of changes in the world beyond academe.

There will be no argument made here that what we need is less education. There should be no question about retreating from goals already achieved; no sudden doubting as to whether the effort and costs associated with this accomplishment were worth it. Put in proper balance, there is no upper limit on the educational attainment for which we could hope our people would aspire. Achievement of that balance, however, requires alternatives ... alternatives that have a recognized value and that have links (just as education has links) to peoples' futures.

The opportunities for youth have come to be focused fairly narrowly on education and training. This is the case even though the "youth" period of life has been extended to age 21 and beyond. It isn't so much that youth are absolutely excluded from all activities except those of education and training; rather, it is that the non-school activities of youth are provided little recognition either by the schools or by an adult society. It should not be a surprise that previous educational attainment dominates the pathways to future <u>educational</u> opportunities; it is somewhat more surprising, however, that education has come to monopolize the routes to economic adulthood. "People," as Ivan Ilich puts it, "are educated into their places in society."

It is educational credentials that matter the most when youth apply for jobs ... and particularly when they apply for jobs that have real "career" possibilities. Education levels probably even count a lot more than we would like to believe in this democratic society in the selection of a marital partner and in our choice of friends.

We live in a "meritocracy" where "merit", particularly so far as young people are concerned, is essentially defined by the educational experience. It is true that within the confines of the youth culture other forms of status do exist. The star athlete, the "rock" musician, the "cheerleader," are provided status, often in degrees completely disproportionate to their accomplishments. This can represent a problem in itself as there is most often no way in which that accomplishment can be carried to the next stage of life. Harry "Rabbit" Angstrom, in Rabbit Run by John Updike, could never quite come to terms with a humdrum adult life after being the town's much adulated basketball star.

The point being that within their culture, youth may be able to eventually find their niche where, if they try hard enough, they can succeed in gaining recognition and acceptance from their peers; but when that youth world, as it must inevitably be, is abandoned, those past acheivements may have little relevance to future possibilities. It's like starting from scratch all over again.

I. The Need for Youth Policy

There is a clear and present need for a youth policy which, in its conceptualization, takes into account a range of possibilities for young people which extend beyond the horizons of what educational institutions can provide alone. In other words, "youth policy" is not equivalent to "education policy."

It is a matter of no small significance that we are beginning to understand that the prospects for educational institutions (and for educational philosophy and policy) also are circumscribed by a too close

identity with youth only, just as youth opportunities are limited by too exclusive attention to what is available only through educational institutions. The doors of education must be opened to let some youth out but also to let more adults back in.

It should be clear from recent past experience that youth policy will be most effective where it takes into account (i) its effects on youth as they move toward full participation, as adults, in society; and (ii) the interests of adults. It will be a mistake to continue to treat youth in isolation from other age groups. Isolation requires protection; and we already have passed the point where the problems of isolation far outweigh most of the risks that would need be taken if youth are to be included rather than excluded from participation in a wider array of societal activities and responsibilities. It is worthwhile asking who is actually being protected by much of the legislation and many of the regulations which purport to be protecting youth. Exploration of questions such as this lead to the inexorable conclusion that the prospects for youth are inextricably intertwined with the prospects for adults.

Logically, the place to begin a search for new opportunities for youth is by exploring the present youth opportunity structure. There likely will be an identifiable "opportunity gap" here that needs mending; but it is also likely (indeed imperative if there are to be any real hopes for success) that the seeds of change have already been planted and that what is required is their careful nurturing and cultivation.

By the time a problem or set of problems reaches the level of national visibility of the present "youth problem", the numbers of people engaged in doing something about it are substantial. In a nation as large and as diverse as is the U.S. it would be surprising indeed if the glimmerings of some future synthesis were not already emergent. That this is the case is reflected in (a) a high degree of consensus among policy makers as to the need for a youth policy, and (b) the general perception of many practitioners that they already are engaged in activities that, in some measure, address this emergent and revised perception of what youth's problems are and who (what institutions and individuals) should be involved in helping resolve them.

Albert Einstein said that, "it is theory which decides what we can observe." Revisions in our thoughts about what youth need require that we re-examine what now exists assessing its adequacy against a revised standard.

II. The Youth Opportunity Structure

What are the opportunities available to youth? What are the consequences to youth of choosing one opportunity rather than another? That is, if a young person decides to leave school at 16 or 17 to work, to engage in volunteer activity, to travel, etc. what are the costs and benefits likely to be? Do these opportunities impact differentially on different segments of the youth population? If a white middle-class youth decides not to go on to college what will be the future effects, relative to the effects that same decision might have on a black youth? Does participation in certain "youth opportunities" act to actually restrict rather than enhance future opportunities?

This section focuses on describing the "youth opportunity structure." It is assumed that the critical elements of such a structure are encompassed by the concepts of education, work and service. It is, however, good to keep in mind, as this largely statistical review proceeds, the extent to which "opportunity" is a relative concept. What is genuine "opportunity" to one may not be to another. The information presented, therefore, largely addresses the extent to which youth are in place and not necessarily the extent to which the places youth are in are right for them.

A. Educational Opportunity

America has been very busy, particularly since World War II, getting an ever higher proportion of its young people through elementary school, high school and on to college. Of each 1000 youngsters entering 5th grade in 1944-45, 848 reached 9th grade, 522 graduated from high school and 234 entered college. Of each 1000 5th graders in the fall of 1962, 963 reached the 9th grade, 752 graduated from high school and 465 entered college in the fall of 1970.

One can hardly overemphasize the importance of the fact that this expansion of the proportion of youth being retained in the education system occurred during a period when, due to the "baby boom," there was a dramatic increase in the youth age cohort. In 1975 there were 44.5 million Americans aged 14-24 years, representing a 66% increase in the population of this age cohort in only 15 years. During this period the secondary schools and colleges not only kept pace with this growth but outstripped it. Between 1960 and 1970 secondary school enrollments increased by 57% from 8,484,869 to 13,282,000. College enrollments, growing from a smaller base, went up from 3,789,000 in 1960 to 8,581,000

in 1970, a 127% increase.

This growth of educational opportunities has impacted on all segments of the youth population with the effect that educational opportunity has come to be more equally distributed. The following chart shows the extent to which the gap between black and white enrollments has been narrowed.

Chart 1

Percent Enrolled in School, by Age:
1965, 1970, and 1974

	Black			White		
Age	1965	1970	1975	1965	1970	1975
16 and 17 years	84	86	87	88	91	88
18 and 19 years	40	40	44	47	49	43
20 and 24 years	9	14	17	20	23	22

However, while it is true blacks are making strides in accessing higher education, the gap between blacks and whites in the percentage of young adults completing four or more years of college is widening. In 1960 the gap between blacks and whites was 6.4% in 1970 it was 7.3%.*

Not as much progress has been made in bringing male and female enrollment to parity at the postsecondary level as it has been for black and white enrollment. In 1971, only 15.7% of 20 to 24 year old females were enrolled in school, contrasted with 29.2% of males. At ages 18 and 19 males are 12 percentage points ahead of females. Apparently, traditional beliefs about who should be educated remain with us in this time of "women's liberation" and the male-female enrollment gap remains wide.

* Companion statistics are not published reflecting trends which may be occurring with those completing 2 or more years of college.

The effects of large increases in enrollments of "traditional" students have already worked their way through the education system. Motivated in the 1950's by the Russian Sputnik space launch, our society institutionalized mechanisms to actively encourage all qualified young people to enter college. High school curricula and counseling programs began operating primarily with the requirements of the college bound in mind. Conceptually, higher education made a shift from an elite orientation to a more meritocratic one. No academically qualified student was to be denied access to college merely on the basis of class, race or financial need. The major higher education response to increased demand from "traditional" students was the "multiversity". Academic, professional and technical schools were collapsed into one large institution where their unique characteristics became less pronounced. This response progressed so far that concern was expressed in the late 60's over the homogeneity and the lack of options in higher education.

It is likely, as Patricia Cross argues in Beyond the Open Door, that a saturation point has been reached so far as the enrollment of "traditional" students is concerned. Increasing attention has been turned to expanding educational opportunities for "new students". This shift in orientation is of more recent origins and its impact on the educational enterprise has only begun. It reflects an increased concern on the part of the educational system for all young people regardless of their backgrounds and qualifications. Regardless of what the motivating factors are for this concern (and they are bound to be complex) it appears that we are in the midst of another shift in the orientation of educational institutions.

Martin Trow wrote of a shift to "mass" higher education. The beginnings of this shift in orientation are reflected in the rapid growth of a new set of educational institutions (the community colleges, UWW) new educational approaches (career education, experiential education, alternative education) and practices (the "stop-out" notion, credentialling of prior work experience) and revised financing priorities (from institutional-centered support to need-based support of individuals. BOG's, voucher experiments). The effect, at least at the perimeters of the education system, is rapid diversification with the called for "more options" emerging in less time than perhaps we had anticipated. It is likely that much of this diversity was already there but our field of vision has now shifted to encompass it. The change in terminology from "higher education" to "post-secondary" education is symbolic of this shift in focus. Beyond this, however, it is clear that a major growth sector of education is in these areas.

For example, since 1965, the number of community and junior colleges (where the average age is higher and average parental income lower than in four year colleges) has increased by 459 institutions, and enrollments have grown by an astronomical 215%. Public colleges too have experienced sizable enrollment increases of about 69% for the same period. Since 1970 only minor decreases and increases have occurred in the percentage of the population aged 18 to 24 enrolled in higher education. However, the participation of the adult population has shown steady increases from 10.9% of the entire adult population in 1969, to 13.3% in 1975. Within occupational programs in institutions of higher education, the number of students completing programs in fields such as engineering, agriculture and forestry, health services, data processing, education

and police and law enforcement have more than doubled from 1967-1971.

The interaction between the traditional and non-traditional sectors of education is only beginning to take shape. Resistance from the traditional sector has focused largely on the fact that the increased diversity has expressed itself most forcefully in the career/vocational areas. The recent debate between U.S. Office of Education Commissioner Bell and Dr. Robert Goldwin, former Dean of St. John's and an Education Advisor to President Ford, is indicative of the current situation. Bell claims that the liberal arts are irrelevant to present economic and employment realities, while Goldwin insists that vocational and career training is too shortsighted for the more fundamental, future needs of society. These developments occur at a sensitive point in time, and particularly for those educators whose philosophical orientations and academic experience can be identified with liberal arts colleges... many of which have fallen on particularly difficult times.

It should be realized that a trend away from a liberal arts tradition and towards a closer link to the work world began much earlier. Throughout the 50's and 60's degrees conferred increased sizably in the scientific and professional fields. Degrees conferred in the humanities and arts increased too but even here the stress began to be placed on preparation for graduate school which ultimately provided access back to teaching in educational institutions.

Chart 2
Earned Bachelors and First Professional
Degrees By Field and Year

Year	Natural Sciences and Related Professions	Humanities (Philosophy Religion, English, Foreign Language) and Fine Arts
1955-56	86,082	45,518
1960-61	11-,296	59,927
1965-66	136,600	95,190

Source: Projections of Educational Statistics, 1966
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Just as high school more and more came to be preparation for college during this period, more and more education through the Baccalaureate level became preparation for graduate school. The coherence of the 4-year liberal arts program began to be depleted in many educational institutions as attention was concentrated on the junior and senior years (after academic majors had been selected) and less attention paid to the freshman and sophomore years.

Recent financial constraints on educational institutions have acted to shape reactions to these educational developments. The prospects of a diminishing potential supply of students due to demographic changes similarly act to condition responses. What the affects of financial hard times will be on educational developments are difficult to assess. The experience of New York City and other large urban areas, which are running into serious budgetary problems, would lead one to wonder about the extent to which urban educational opportunities can continue to be expanded. This will have obvious consequences for the pursuit of equal educational opportunities for blacks and other minorities. Meanwhile, the combination of need-based

financing arrangements and rising tuition levels at many post-secondary institutions has tended to threaten the capacity of young people from middle class backgrounds to afford education beyond high school.

The attractiveness of the educational opportunity is, to a considerable degree, conditioned by the extent to which it is distributed. There was a time when possession of a high school diploma conferred upon one a certain status in society and access to other opportunities that were not as easily open to those who did not have it. For those who have strong feelings about the value of education for its own sake, it has been disturbing that participation in education has also served this "screening" function. Today, it is almost taken for granted that young people will complete high school. In any case, there are considerable penalties associated with failing to do so. Having done so, however, confers few special advantages anymore. As participation rates in postsecondary education have risen the "magic" of the college diploma, too, has tended to be demythologized. The more people who have the diploma, the less it can act as an effective screening mechanism. The situation develops where, from the individual's perspective, possession of a college degree does not guarantee an interview much less a job. On the other hand, there is an increasing range of jobs for which a degree is an essential minimum qualification. If this kind of psychology is permitted to develop, many individuals will have little choice but to pursue a college education even though they have little interest and even where they recognize that possession of a college degree has reached a point of not negative, but diminishing returns so far as employment opportunities are concerned. Where this "reluctant attender" syndrome develops, individuals,

educational institutions and the society at large are damaged. The nature of any "opportunity" is changed dramatically when the incentives to accept the "opportunity are so strong as to make any other "opportunity" path infeasible.

James O'Toole in several articles in Change Magazine speaks of the possibilities of and problems associated with increasing numbers of young people being educated/trained with particular skills having particular expectations to perform particular jobs which do not exist in sufficient supply to absorb their numbers. This "reserve army of unemployed," as the vision goes, can invade the jobs previously occupied by individuals less educated and trained at this point of entry. This "bumping" effect will proceed downward through the occupational structure knocking off the bottom rung of the occupational ladder, a group that is the least capable of making a switch to new occupations. As a result, this group becomes additional and permanent members of society's welfare rolls. Meanwhile, the individuals who are in the jobs, express not gratefulness for, but dissatisfaction with, work roles which draw so minimally on their storehouse of abilities. This vision is supported by a much bandied about statistic which projects that by 1980, 40% of the population having post-secondary degrees will enter an economy in which, based on present job requirements, only 20% of the jobs will require a B.A. Further reinforcement of this vision of the future can be found already established in many nations around the world where "underemployment" is a persistent fact of life. In these nations (most of them underdeveloped) the most frustrated (and not infrequently the most capable) immigrate to lands

where the opportunities seem sunnier (the "brain drain"). This alternative is not open to Americans. In this regard "the buck stops here", America is the land of opportunity. Our graduates have no place else to go.

There are prospects, however, for a brighter future where education establishes its balance and relationship to other activities in the society. In this way our expectations for what can be accomplished for individuals and for the society through education can be brought into balance with reality. There are numerous recent developments which demonstrate education's awareness of and interest in these new imperatives.

To cite only a few examples: new patterns of educational attendance are emerging. "Stop-out" experiences are on the increase where young people can either defer admissions into college after high school or take a year out between, say, sophomore and junior years.

While, in general, employers pay more attention to a person's educational background as a qualification for employment than was true in the recent past, educators are beginning to pay more attention to the benefits of experience as legitimate means of fulfilling educational requirements. Opportunities to integrate education with work or service experiences are on the increase. Witness the rise in cooperative education enrollments and the expansion of internship opportunities, independent study projects and service opportunities.

The linkages between secondary and higher education are becoming more complex. To illustrate, through the Advance Placement Program, college courses are offered to qualified students while still in high

school. The College Level Examination Program (CLEP) provides high school graduates (and others) with a means of demonstrating their educational competence in an increasing number of subject matter areas thus making it possible for them to get course credit for those areas in which they have demonstrated competence. Often where open admissions are practiced neither the high school diploma nor its external equivalent (the GED) need be acquired to attain admission. Further, as secondary schools develop, relationships between secondary and higher education will continue to get more complicated as students from a greater variety of educational and experiential backgrounds seek admission to colleges and universities.

Adult education programs have operated, for many years, at the periphery of our educational institutions. These programs have been much more influenced by rather than had an influence upon, what might be called, the core of educational practice. The possibility that this balance will shift in the future is not remote. Programs such as the New York State Regent's Degree Program, the SUNY -- Empire State College, The University Without Walls, Minnesota Metropolitan and others operate relatively free of the incumbrances of traditional higher education. New clients are being served, new means of educational delivery are being experimented with. For example, the use of "mentors" rather than teachers, greater reliance upon the student to design and implement his or her own technology as instructional means. New means of both assessment and credentialling are being tried out. Obviously these practices in and of themselves add new dimensions to the higher education scene; but, in addition, as such initiatives gain acceptance, they are likely to have an

effect on conventional higher education practice as well.

What an educational degree certifies has gone through enormous changes in the past several decades. In 1854 Cardinal Newman in his highly influential book The Idea of a University argues that if a choice has to be made between a "university which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendance and gave its degrees to anyone who passed an examination in a wide range of 'subjects'" and "a university which had no professors or examination but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years (presumably in common intellectual pursuit)" he would without question choose the latter. This hypothetical choice has never had to be made in its purest form. But clearly to Cardinal Newman the possession of a university degree certified first possession of an intellectual experience as a member, for a specified period of time, of a "community of scholars" and only incidentally the possession of some specific, definable and testable body of knowledge. One need only think what possession of a Harvard, Yale or Princeton degree certifies (or certified until very recently) to see modern applicability of this point of view. Surely an A.B. in literature from Harvard certified one as being "a Harvard man" as much as, probably more than, it certified one as expert in literature.

As linkages between employment and higher education are strengthened, as more and more specialized degrees are developed corresponding to various professional-occupational roles in society, possession of a college degree in an increasing proportion of instances certifies possession, not so much of a common educational experience, but of a certain specific body of knowledge. Once certification comes to be identified with the acqui-

sition of definable and testable bodies of knowledge new forms of education delivery become possible. Large non-residential universities are logical outcomes of this perspective, open universities providing "external degrees" are another. Patricia Cross in Beyond the Open Door contrasted the very separate assumptions that lie behind credentialling practices that likely will co-exist in America in the 70's. Internal (conventional) degree programs certify "the pathways regardless of the final level of accomplishment, external degree programs certify the level of accomplishment regardless of the pathway."

In the final analysis, however, these kinds of adjustments cannot and should not occur only within the context of education. The needed balance will be achieved only where other agencies of society recognize their responsibilities and assert their strengths in the "youth development" area.

b. Employment Opportunities

Perhaps contrary to popular impression, more youth are working today than at anytime in the last 2 decades. (Which, by the way, is different from saying youth are working more.) Because of the large increases in the youth population it might be expected that the absolute number of youth working would increase, it is somewhat more surprising, however, to discover that a higher proportion of this larger population group are also working. Between 1960 and 1970 actual employment of 16-19 year olds rose by 49%. In 1974 7.4 million full and part-time jobs were held by 16-19 year olds while the number in 1960 was 4.1 million. Labor force participation rates for 16-19 year old males are up from 58.6% in 1960 to 60.2% in 1975 and from 39.1% to 49% for females. These rates have

dropped somewhat between 1960 and 1975 for 20-24 year old males (from 88.9% to 84.5%) but have increased significantly for females from 46.1% to 64%.

Chart 3. Labor Force Participation Rates by Age and Sex

(Percent)

Both Sexes	1960	1970	1975
16 years and over	59.2	60.3	61.0
Males			
16 years and over	82.4	79.2	77.2
16 - 19	58.6	57.5	60.2
20 - 24	88.9	85.1	84.5
25 - 54	95.8	94.6	93.4
55 - 64	85.2	81.5	74.7
65 and over	32.2	25.8	20.8
Females			
16 years and over	37.1	42.8	45.8
16 - 19	39.1	43.7	49.0
20 - 24	46.1	57.5	64.0
25 - 54	42.6	49.8	54.7
55 - 64	36.7	42.5	40.7
65 and over	10.5	9.2	7.8

The darker side of these statistics is that the youth unemployment rate also has increased significantly. It was 10% in 1947, when these statistics were first collected on 16-19 year olds; it went down to 8% in 1953 but has been climbing ever since. Even prior to this recession the youth unemployment rate climbed to 14%, roughly 4½ times the unemployment rate experienced by adults. In the last several years the unemployment rate for youth has fluctuated between 15% and 20%.

In general, the employment system hasn't done as good a job coping with all the young people who need jobs as the education system has for youth who need an education.

Perhaps the clearest illustration of this is that, while the gap between school enrollments for whites and blacks has been closing during the past 2 decades, the opposite has been the case so far as the relative unemployment rates between white and black youth are concerned.

> Up until the late 1940's there was little difference in unemployment rate between white and black teenagers. By 1960, the black rate was 1.8 times that for whites. In 1972 it was 2.4 times. The deterioration continues undeterred by record rates of overall job expansion. Whatever the virus in the system is here, it is not yielding to any of the prescribed treatments, nor is it clear that the precise strain is in fact yet isolated. (P. Barton)

Today, the unemployment rate for 16-19 year olds is 18.4%, and it is 16.1% for white youth and 40.3% for black youth.

If not part of the explanation for this at least a significant development is the extent to which jobs for youth are part-time or summer jobs. In 1974 over three-quarters of the jobs held by 16 and 17 year olds were part-time. Of the full-time jobs held by this age group more than 50% of them were held for less than 13 weeks. (That is, they were very likely to be summer or vacation-time full-time jobs.) For 18 and 19 year olds almost half of the jobs were part-time and of the full-time jobs held about 30% of these were of less than 13 weeks duration. What these statistics reveal is that the kind of opportunities available to youth are of such a nature that they can often be held by students. "Dropping-out" of school, therefore, doesn't necessarily put one in an advantageous position so far as competition for these jobs is concerned. Indeed, it might be a disadvantage, because it is expected that people this age <u>should</u> be in school.

Indeed, there is a sharply increasing overlap between the "in-school" and "in the work force" figures. Thirty-nine percent of 16-17 year old males in-school in 1970 were also in the labor force, up from 34% in 1960. Among 18 and 19 year old males, the 1970 figure was 41%, up from 35%. The increases among in-school females have been even larger; up from 23% in 1960 to 34% in 1970 for 16-17 year olds, and from 28% to 38% for 18-19 year olds. According to Willard Wirtz about half of 16-19 year olds who are in-school are also getting some outside employment during the course of the year and of that group about three out of every four young people are getting some kind of actual work experience prior to their leaving school.

It may be becoming easier for a teenager to get a job while in-school than it is if he or she is not. While the statistics may be of only symbolic value because they report on different segments of the population, it is a fact that the unemployment rate for out-of-school youth exceeds the rate of in-school youth (17.2% to 15.7% in 1970).

The extent to which job opportunities for youth are part-time or are available only during the summer months reflects the degree to which youth jobs have taken on a distinctive character of their own. By and large, employers have become used to doing without a relatively permanent/long term commitment of youth. Whether this was a result of choice or of necessity is a matter of historical conjecture. Since the beginning of World War II, however, the clearest options open to most 17-19 year old males have been school and military service. Employment may have been a possibility but its duration was not likely to be long because of conscription. In any case, the whole attitude of the society was to

better the next generation through the education of its young, to get youth out of work and into school.

The jobs available to teenage males, in particular, came to be designed with an assumption that the job commitment was temporary and/or secondary to other interests. Studies by Gavett, Diamond, the National Manpower Institute and Friedman indicate that there is little room at the bottom rung of corporate career ladders for people under 20 years of age. Even jobs which require a high school education or less aren't being filled with people under 20. The average age of entrants into union apprenticeship programs has been steadily rising as well.

The situation is somewhat different for females who tend to be relegated quite early to traditional "female" occupations. Access to various types of jobs held by women appear to be more a function of education than age.

The fact of the matter is that even if youth decide to leave school in order to pursue a career at ages 16-19 the chances are that the kinds of work experiences to be found will <u>not</u> be ones that offer career opportunities. The opportunities most likely will be found in that sector of the labor market which has been reserved for youth and which has weak, and indirect, linkages into the "adult" work force.

Even though youth are more often combining schooling and working these days, in the vast majority of instances the one has little to do with the other.

During the 60's several programs were begun such as the Federal Work-Study Program and the Neighborhood Youth Corps program for "disadvantaged" youth. The primary objectives of such efforts, however, were to provide youth with opportunities to earn money which would enable them to stay in school or to provide them with the motivation to not drop-out of school. In their conception, implementation and evaluation the experiential aspects of these initiatives has gone largely ignored, at least until recently. A major exception to this rule was the growth of cooperative education programs at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. Cooperative education was conceived of as an educational program, usually vocational in orientation, for persons who receive instruction through a jointly planned and supervised arrangement between school and employers, alternating classroom study with on-the-job experience.

Efforts to expand initiatives which link together education and experiential opportunities presently are being pursued with diligence. The base from which these efforts must grow, however, is fairly small and is endangered by high unemployment rates among adults as well as other barriers to be discussed later. Statistics on these school-arranged work experience opportunities are difficult to come by. Available information suggests the very rough estimate that there are currently some 800,000 junior and senior year high school students (13% of the total) in these "arranged" programs and perhaps 750,000 (9%) college students.

It is likely, however, that these figures overlook substantial and growing numbers of both secondary and post-secondary students who are gaining useful at work experience but who are not considered to be occupying actual work stations. For example, career education, which has

gained so much momentum in the last five years, quite commonly includes an experiential component.

In the Experience-Based Career Education program students are placed in a variety of work settings and such experiences are tied in closely with a learning plan and monitored and rewarded accordingly, that is, credit is given but not pay. In the case of school-based career education initiatives, quite commonly it is specified as an objective that every student have x hours of actual off-campus work experience during the course of the year. Again, compensation is usually not a factor as many of these "experiential situations" are defined as "learning" rather than "production" situations. Another program, the Executive High School Internship program, which is now operating nationwide, places students who usually are in their last year of high school and from the upper strata of their classes, in semester long internship experiences for no pay, with executives of public, not-for-profit and private agencies.

The growth of these types of school arranged experiential opportunities...sometimes for pay, sometimes not, most times for credit but not always...calls into question our convenient distinctions between learning and working. So long as getting an education was essentially something that occured in the school building, the distinction were relatively easy to maintain; but, when getting an education is perceived as something that can happen in the community... even in the work place...the situation is, indeed, altered. New possibilities emerge, but the interests of previously relatively distant constituencies, like those of labor and business, are brought into play and must be addressed.

C. Opportunities for Service

The third leg of the three-legged stool upon which this attempt at youth policy development rests is that of service. While our concepts of what constitutes education and work have changed...and in some instances blurred and blended together...our sense of what constitutes service has never been very well defined. Therefore, almost any effort to talk about "service" must begin with an attempt at definition.

As used here "service" is an activity performed for the public welfare at less than the prevailing wage or for no compensation at all. In other words, the "service" concept would encompass the efforts of volunteer firemen but not professional firemen...it would include the efforts of young people engaged in environmental/ecological improvement projects through the young Adult Conservation Corps but not the fully paid activities of a perhaps similar nature performed by members of the Park Service...it would include the efforts of Peace Corps Volunteer teachers but not Peace Corps staff or domestic teachers. In other words, one element of "service" is some potential sacrifice of income while working for the public good. Such a definition of "service" does not preclude the possibility, even probability, that financial gain is an important motivating factor in many individual decisions to participate.

Another distinguishing feature of some "service" activity has to do with whether or not participation is mandatory or voluntary. It seems fair to say that if an individual is compelled to participate, as they were in the recent past, in the military because of conscription, then the activity can be characterized as "service" even if in-service compensation were competitive with out-of-service compensation. Arguing along these same lines, service

situations can be distinguished from non-service situations by the nature of the contract between the individual and the group with which the individual is serving. Even in the "All-Volunteer" Military Service individuals do not retain the right to terminate the contract and are subject to different rights, rules and penalties than are civilians.

If these distinctions were applied, then, any compulsory national service program would qualify as "service" by virtue of the forfeiture of the individual's right to choose whether or not to participate. However, any non-mandatory national youth program would not qualify under this definition as service, except to the extent the compensation provided were beneath the prevailing wage.

Having made at least a cursory effort at defining what kinds of activities fit into the "service" universe it is still very difficult to establish numbers of youth who have engaged in service activities.

Americans Volunteer, published by the Action Agency, revealed that some 3,747,000 14-17 year olds (22% of the age cohort) and 4,641,000 18-24 year olds (18% of the population cohort) engaged in volunteer (unpaid) service during 1974.* Lest the large numbers impress too much, it is important to remember that most volunteer effort is done on a part-time basis with 50% of volunteers putting in less than 25 hours during this year. According to Don Eberly of the Action Agency, who has kept closer tabs on these matters than anyone else, these figures translate into about 300,000 (for 14-17 year olds) and 425,000 (for 18-24 year olds) man-years of volunteer effort.

---

* Many of these activities would likely not fit into the definition of "service" provided here because they would not all strictly qualify as being on the public welfare. For example, the largest share of volunteer activities take place under the aegis of religious institutions. Only a portion of these activities could be defined as relating primarily to the public rather than the institution's welfare.

Harold Wolozin has calculated that the contributions to the society of these 14-24 year old volunteers totalled approximately $7.5 billion.

The following chart shows, not surprisingly, that rates of volunteer service rise proportionate to income with youth from families with incomes in excess of $20,000 per year participating in excess of 1½ times the rate of individuals from families of less than $7,500 per year. Whites are more than two times as likely to participate in volunteer service as are blacks, women are more likely to volunteer than men, but employed and unemployed individuals participate at approximately the same rate.

Number and Proportion of Respondents Doing Volunteer Work May 1973 - April 1974

AGE	14 - 17		18 - 24	
	No. of Persons	Rate of Volunteering	No. of Persons	Rate of Volunteering
Sex (Total)	16,675,000	22%	25,320,000	18%
Male	8,455,000	17	12,110,000	17
Female	8,220,000	28	13,211,000	20
Color				
White	14,167,000	25%	21,863,000	20%
Non-White	2,509,000	10	3,457,000	10
Employment Status				
Employed	4,294,000	30%	16,230,000	18%
Unemployed	826,000	28	1,809,000	15
Not in Labor Force	11,555,000	19	7,282,000	21
Educational Background				
Less than four years of high school	16,528,000	22%	5,861,000	12%
4 yrs. high school	-	-	11,089,000	16
College, less than four years	-	-	6,523,000	25
College, four years or more	-	-	1,848,000	30
Family Income				
0-$3,999	1,167,000	11%	2,564,000	16%
$4,000-$7,499	2,217,000	17	4,329,000	16
$7,500-$9,999	1,522,000	24	2,737,000	16
$10,000-$14,999	3,708,000	25	5,480,000	20
$15,000-$19,999	2,208,000	25	2,652,000	21
$20,000 & over	2,466,000	32	2,758,000	26
Not available	3,389,000	18	4,801,000	15

In 1974 394,000 17-22 year olds (or 2% of the age group) were enlisted in the military. These numbers do not include the 175,000 persons in high school ROTC or the 320,000 persons in college ROTC, Reserves and National Guard. According to a recent paper by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Defense, "Population Representation in the All-Volunteer Service," rural areas continue to supply a slightly larger share of the new recruits than their numbers in the population would suggest. While blacks constitute 13% of the 17-22 year old population they accounted for 18% of accessions to the military service. This figure, however, represents a significant drop from 21% in 1974. For the most part recruits come from middle income families and neighborhoods.

The per cent of enlistees who are from families below $9000 per year are about equal to their per cent in the population; enlistees from families with annual incomes between $9000 and $17,000 are slightly over-represented; and individuals from families with annual incomes over $17,000 are significantly under-represented. It is interesting to note that while the educational attainment level of the entire active military force stands at an all-time high, the per cent of enlistees with 1 or more years of college dropped dramatically with the advent of the All-Volunteer Force. In 1971, 20.6% of enlistees had one or more years of college. By 1973 it had dropped to 11.2% and to 5.5% in 1974; but, in 1975 it rose back to 6.4%, no doubt, in large part, due to economic hard times. At the other end of the spectrum the per cent of non-high school graduates enlisted dropped from 34.5% in 1974 to 28.3% in 1975. Sixty-five percent in 1975 (up from 60% in 1974) of enlistees had a high school diploma or its equilavency but, as yet, no college.

It appears that military enrollment is increasingly seen as a viable alternative for many recent high school graduates to entrance into the labor force (where, due to high youth unemployment rates, their experience may not be entirely happy) or to entrance into post-secondary education. This expanded interest on the part of high school graduates in the military may be squeezing out non-high school graduate applicants. At the same time the significant reduction of enlistees with college level experience has caused some problems, particularly in branches of the military which have become accustomed to relatively easy access to college level personnel (with jobs being designed accordingly).

Besides strictly "volunteer" services, (service situations which have developed through private or local initiatives and military service), there are several programs sponsored by the federal government which most often are looked towards as potential models for a national youth service initiative.* Most of us are familiar with the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration programs during the depression years which engaged the services of millions of American youth. The best known of current efforts are, of course, the Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and the Young Adult Conservation Corps. The first two of these have already demonstrated their success as service programs for youth and adults as well. There continues to be doubt, however, regarding the extent to which these models can be applied to significantly greater numbers of young people. As they both focus on provision of "technical assistance" to less developed nations or "disadvantaged" segments of communities, there are necessarily

* For a fuller discussion these initiatives see "Universal Youth Service Milestones," 1945-1975" by Don Eberly prepared for the Universal Youth Service Conference, April 1976.

reasonably high standards for acceptance. Since their beginnings the average age of the participants in Peace Corps and VISTA has tended to creep upward and the vast majority are either college graduates and/or over 22 years of age.* Participants in these programs are provided a modest living allowance and a sum of money is set aside each month as savings which becomes available at termination of service.

The Young Adult Conservation Corps, modelled after the CCC, provides full-time year round conservation jobs on public lands and waterways. All youth between 19 and 24 years of age are eligible. There is no "poverty" requirement. The number of youth participating in these programs has grown from 3,200 in 1972 to 13,000 in 1975. Authorizing legislation has passed the House expand this program to 100,000 placements in 1977 and to 500,000 by 1980.

Another model for youth service, which has been submitted to several years of promising experimentation in King County, Washington is the Action Agency sponsored Program for Local Service (PLS). Unique characteristics of this program are:

- All youth between 19 and 24 years of age are eligible.
- A bank of 1 year service opportunities are developed with public or non-profit organizations. Such service work must be of an anti-poverty nature and not replace regular employees.
- "Service agreements" are reached between each youth and the individual within an agency or group with which the youth will be working. "Brokers" are used in working up such agreements so that assignments and responsibilities are clear and so that assignments are seen as useful to all parties concerned.

---

* Today, the budgets of the Peace Corps and Vista are $80 million and $45 million, respectively. At its peak the Peace Corps budget exceeded $100 million and over 15,000 volunteers were enlisted. Vista enrollments have never exceeded 5000.

- While administrative costs have been supported, in the main, by federal resources, the program is locally developed and administered. The program enccurages youth to work in their own community.

- A stipend of approximately $3000 per year is provided. (This is about 75% of the minimum wage.)

Although only 700 youth participated in this experiment, a wide cross-section of youth were reached. The most common characteristic of applicants was that they were unemployed. While the program has many of the characteristics of public service employment programs, it may be able to avoid the negative "labeling" most of these programs have been subjected to because of the focus on youth, on local service, and, particularly, because the program is open for all youth.

Two programs in Canada also have attracted considerable notice. They are Local Initiatives Program (LIP) and Opportunities for Youth (OFY). Both are aimed at unemployed youth, making available grant monies which enable youth to work on "community needs" projects of their own design. OFY is a summer program; LIP provides grants of up to 6 months duration. In 1973 85,000 youth in 6000 projects were involved in LIP at a cost of $165 million. In that same year OFY involved 36,000 youth in 4350 projects at a cost of $40 million. These two programs are mentioned principally because of their efforts to be responsive to youth's perceptions of important activities to be undertaken. Youth identify or design their own projects as distinct from being placed in or selecting from assignments already developed.

* * * * * * *

As it has become more accepted that formal education is something that can be acquired outside the classroom as well as within the classroom, opportunities for mixing or alternating education and service have increased. A number of "service-learning" programs have emerged in the last few years which take advantage of the learning opportunities resident in the service sector.

The University Year for Action (UYA), in existence since 1971, provides year-long service experiences for academic credit for approximately 2,000 students. Stipends of approximately $3,000 per year are provided. The programs are administered by universities through grants made available by Action.

Another Action Program, the Youth Challenge Program (YCP), begun in 1975, provides operational grants to secondary, post-secondary or community institutions to develop demonstration programs to encourage 14-21 year olds to serve part-time on projects which link the service experience with classroom learning. No compensation is provided specifically through this program but participants could be compensated from other sources, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps funds, if appropriate linkages were made between these efforts. In 1975, $250,000 worth of grant monies were divided among 19 recipient institutions. Approximately 2,000 students participated. YCP is one of the few federal initiatives in the service area which reaches youth of high school age.

The vast majority of College Work-Study Program placements occur on campus. Of the 560,000 College Work-Study students from over 3,000 post-secondary institutions, only about 75,000 are placed off-campus. Major reasons why most CWSP placements occur on campus are that the program is

conceived of and often administered (i) as an income maintenance program and (ii) as a means of getting government subsidy for having various on-campus chores performed. While there is potential for CWSP to become an important means of furthering the integration of education and service opportunity, it is fair to say that until this point in time it has generally not been implemented with this objective in mind. Another reason why the vast majority of CWSP placements are on campus is that post-secondary institutions often do not possess the outreach needed to make effective placements in the public and nonprofit sectors. In 1966 the Urban Corps developed, first in New York City, in part, to fill this void serving as urban universities' administrative center for development of off-campus opportunities, particularly with city agencies. Today, there are some 70 Urban Corps offices which place approximately 15,000 College-Work Study students annually.

Federal Programs Providing
Opportunities for Public Service, 1975

Name	Annual Enrollment
Peace Corps	6,800
VISTA	4,500
Youth Challenge	2,000
College Work-Study Program (off-campus)	
Urban Corps	15,000
Other	60,000
Program for Local Service	700
University Year for Action	2,000
Young Adult Conservation Corps	13,000
TOTAL	94,000

* * * * * * *

Type of Service	Ages	
	14 - 17	18 - 24
Volunteer Work (from Americans Volunteer)	3,747,000	4,641,000
Military Service (from Americans Volunteer)	220,000	1,435,000
Federally-sponsored Service Programs (guesswork)	2,000	107,000
TOTAL	3,969,000	6,283,000

The strongest impression one takes from this brief review of youth service activities is the extent to which youth service remains largely unnoticed, unrecorded and largely unconnected to educational or employment interests or to the accomplishment of larger social goals. In the Action-Survey, we learn of impressive numbers of youth volunteering, but we really know very little about the nature and quality of those activities. These activities, for the most part, evolve locally in response to particular needs and not as part of a thought-out plan as to how the community and youth could most benefit from youths' service involvement. Organizations such as the National Commission on Resources for Youth in New York City play an important role in attempting to track, record and encourage youth involvement in communities through service activities. The National Student Volunteer Program within Action, similarly, plays an important role as a "clearinghouse" for youth service activities and in providing technical assistance to people interested in developing youth service initiatives. Yet, important as these activities are, the extent to which the youth service universe can be impacted is limited indeed in the absence of some stronger national sense of the imporance of youth service.

The second powerful impression one takes from this review is that that sense of importance has not taken form at the national level. Less than

100,000 youth are captured by the various national programs which were identified here. It is likely that significant initiatives were ignored, but, even if that number was doubled or tripled the total would seem miniscule.

Finally, it is clear from this review that when youth service is talked about, people 19 years of age and over are usually the subject of conversation. It should be remembered, however, that in 1974 over 200,000 17 and 18 year olds(most young men) enlisted in the military. For them further education was apparently not the answer; civilian employment was either not accessible or was not the preferred alternative. In orther words, service was the most viable alternative for a significant number of youngsters past the age of compulsory school attendance. It is likely that if opportunities were available to youth under 19 in national or community service, they would be taken and very possibly would have as significant an impact on those young lives as the military does on the lives of their peers who choose that form of service.

* * * * * * *

Consideration of major support for a national youth service program already has gone through several rounds of debate and there are indications that the matter may be coming up again.

Why have discussions in the past stopped short of significant implementation?

There is really no question as to whether service opportunities can influence youth. Experience with the CCC, the Peace Corps, VISTA and, of course, with military service, demonstrate the strong impact service experiences can exert on the development of youth. Further, various public opinion polls, over the years, which have tested public receptivity to the

general idea of youth service, have indicated strong support. The real issue seems that of getting sustained public agreement to support specific forms of youth service. Public support for compulsory military conscription has dwindled to a point where the public appears prepared to pay considerably higher recruitment and wage costs in order not to have to deal with the many problems this practice created. Support for the Peace Corps was depleted because (oversimplifying grossly), of conservative opposition within the U.S. and, largely, liberal opposition abroad to transporting American youth to often distant lands to provide "technical assistant" which, at times, wasn't wanted and, at other times, which the volunteers were not always capable of providing. Support for VISTA, too, has failed to expand to permit development of a major national program for similar reasons. Local opposition to VISTA, in some cases, has developed to liberal, most often white, and often middle class or above, young people coming to work in principally black, minority or poverty areas. Conservative opposition to "radical" youth working in already troubled quarters of American Society was also a factor in reducing support for another of the Kennedy-era youth initiatives.

The most obvious point at which discussions have broken down, not surprisingly, has been at the point when issues of finance have arisen. Estimates of the costs of a universal youth service program run high. (For example, Amatai Etzioni estimated in 1973 that the annual costs of a universal youth service program would be in the $15-20 billion range.) Without dismissing budgetary realities and the extent to which those realities can affect the prospects for implementing the most promising of ideas, a plausible case can be made that the problem of finding agreement has not only been one of inability to nail down the funds. In spite of much debate, many issues remain unresolved. To cite a few examples: Should the program be compulsory or

voluntary? Can or should national service substitute for military service (or vice versa)? To what extent is it feasible to arrange for and properly place thousands of youth in quality service situations? Would creation of service opportunities in large numbers threaten employment opportunities for those in need of full wages? What is the appropriate level and form of compensation for service? What is/are the appropriate agency/agencies to administer a national youth service program? What are the linkages between these service agencies and other institutions concerned with youth? What happens to youth after they come out of these programs...that is from the perspective of the individual participant, what are the routes back to education or to regular employment? To what extent will there be local or community involvement in the design, selection and implementation of youth service programs? If participation isn't compulsory and if slots are limited, on what basis do we choose who participates? For what range of purposes will services be made available...will the services rendered be focused on working with the "disadvantaged" (as is the case with the current ACTION programs) or will other community and national concerns be addressed as well?

In any case, whether the reason be lack of money or failure to resolve basic issues, the fact is that no major youth service program has emerged as yet.

However, in spite of the limited size of the current federally-sponsored effort, significant experience has been gained which likely can be applied to resolving issues if and as another round of national youth service debate is enjoined.

For example, the Peace Corps has made adjustments in its basic program orientation and recruitment effort which have brought it some increasing receptivity abroad endeavoring to do a better job of matching the more specialized

skills of volunteers with specific and recognized technical needs of developing nations. Vista has sought to recruit and involve youth from backgrounds and communities more similar to those in which they will be working, demonstrating greater awareness of communities possible sensitivity to youthful advisors from outside. The Program for Local Service, on a much smaller scale, has demonstrated that a service program that is open to all can actually attract the participation of individuals from a wide variety of backgrounds, overcoming some of the negative labeling that usually accompanies public service employment initiatives. Programs such as Opportunities for Youth and the Local Involvement Program in Canada remind us first, that youth can develop their own service projects and, second, that the character of those assignments are affected by engaging the energies and imagination of youth at the first step in the process rather than further on down the line. Youth Conservation Corps programs show the desirability of having a basically residential program option which enables, again, a broad specturm of youth to work together in another setting on environmental and conservation problems. The Youth Challenge Program, University Year for Action and other programs demonstrate the possibility and desirability of linking together educational and service opportunities into what has come to be known as "service-learning." The provision of academic credit for service rendered represents but, one possible reward for useful service. The Community Service Fellowship Program (also called the G.I. Bill for Community Service), not yet mentioned, suggests yet another possible way of rewarding service: granting educational entitlements to those having completed a period of "community service" much as many participants in military service have had the benefit of the G.I. Bill.

Perhaps going beyond lessons learned from these quite limited federally-sponsored initiatives, is the continuing interest of youth in military service. And, finally, it must be recognized that the vast majority of youth service options are initiated and implemented locally by the individual acting on his or her own or with the guidance or encouragement from various community institutions. A national youth service initiative, to be successful, must build from and capitalize on this community level interest rather than compete with it.

III. A Policy for Youth: New Options in Education, Work and/or Service

There is need for a comprehensive youth policy in this country which is concerned primarily, not with increasing services to youth, but rather with enlarging the opportunities for youth to engage in activities which prove rewarding to them and society.

The major thrusts of such a policy are (i) the continued enlargement of options within education including: the reconstitution of liberal education, the vitalization of vocational education, the establishment of career education, the expansion of alternative education, and the legitimation of and increase in the opportunities to mix education with work or service; (ii) the recognition of work as a valued option for youth which they, just as adults, have a right to expect to be available. It would be wrong if our employment policies failed to recognize the seriousness to many youth of lack of employment opportunities. It is wrong that increases in educational opportunities are seen as making up for shortages in employment opportunities. Without lowering necessary safeguards against exploitation, changes in our attitudes toward employers who engage youth, as well as changes in our attitudes toward youth who work rather than go to school, are called for. Seventeen, eighteen and nineteen year old wage earners need to be brought into the mainstream of employment opportunities not isolated in a secondary labor market. New apprenticeship-

type career systems need to be developed which really build from the bottom up. Today, there is literally no room at the bottom in many career fields. At the same time, "stopping-out" of school for participation in work (or service) should not raise barriers to returning to education at some later time; (iii) the development of a national youth service initiative which ties together yet encourages and enlarges on the diversity of efforts that already are underway at the federal, state and local levels. Such an initiative should encourage involvement by public, private, and nonprofit institutions recognizing such a range of support is needed to sustain a diversity of opportunities. While seeking recognition and reward of service performed in the public welfare as legitimate activity in its own right, the initiative should endeavor to forge much stronger links between service opportunities and education and work opportunities than has been the case in the past.

If a policy for youth which encompasses education, work and service opportunities is to come to fruition, certain issues must be addressed and actions taken.

Some of the critical issues appear to be:

- What institutions in our society are fundamentally responsible for seeing that 16 to 22 year old youth successfully make the transition to adulthood?

- Are educational institutions the ones that have primary responsibility or must other interests be brought into the picture? And, if the latter, which ones and how?

- Are we really willing to accept, even conceptually, education, work and service as coequal activities for youth? If we are, how can we move toward its recognition in practice? Or are we committed to the belief that youth should be in school and that schooling should and can provide enough diversity to meet the needs of all youth?

- What are the appropriate responsibilities of various levels of government within the context of a comprehensive youth policy? What

mechanisms exist or need to exist to assure that these responsibilities will be carried out?

• In order to implement a youth policy which encompasses education, work and service opportunities, to what extent is it necessary to establish administrative processes that bring all those perspectives together? How can we maintain the independence of various institutions and at the same time have some reasonable assurance that at least a portion of their independent activities are supportive of the general policy?

• Do we believe that youth policy can be developed and implemented without input from youth? Or do we believe that youth not just should but can be effective and responsible participants in the policy development and implementation processes? How do we identify spokesmen for youth with some reasonable expectation that they will be representative of a significant range of youth interests nad perspectives?

• A particularly thorny question is, how is the development of a comprehensive youth policy affected by policy decisions and priorities which do not specifically focus on youth or by conditions of the more general population? When unemployment rates for adults are running high, what is the effect on expansion of work experience opportunities for youth? What will union attitudes likely be toward experience-based career education, or expanded cooperative education opportunities or toward more flexible interpretations of child labor and minimum wage laws when many union members are out of work? What will be the public's reaction to youth service programs when public service opportunities for adults out of work are scarce? What will the reaction of teachers unions be to expanded off-campus experiences for students when teachers are having a rough time finding work? What will be the likely willingness of post-secondary education institutions to support the idea of expanded service opportunities for youth when demographic trends, not to mention the impact of inflation on relatively fixed educational budgets, seem to be working against them? The kinds of issues these questions raise are not necessarily insurmountable except if we fail to address them. Again, youth policy cannot be implemented as something that happens in isolation from policies which affect adults.

• A related matter: What existing or pending legislation exists that could serve to further youth policy implementation? What changes could be made in existing or pending legislation that also would advance the implementation of youth policy? What problems have arisen/will arise from piecemeal development of youth policy? What legislation needs to be developed which is specifically supportive of a comprehensive youth policy?

• Much current legislation pertaining to youth employment, training and service focuses on the "disadvantaged." Often, either program participation is limited to youth from "disadvantaged" backgrounds or the programs must have impact on "disadvantaged" populations. The apparent assumption is that youth from non-poverty backgrounds, who are not "drop-out" prone are comparatively well served by the options that now are available to them. Is this the case? If it is <u>not</u> then is the answer to develop more special focus programs or to adopt a strategy of increasing the options but removing the "advantaged"/"disadvantaged" criteria for participation?

The way many of these questions are phrased likely reveals the prejudices of the author. The fact of the matter is, however, that they all raise issues around which it will be difficult to arrive at any significant consensus...and unless we can arrive at significant consensus, our personal preferences don't matter a bit because nothing will happen.

In view of this, significant effort needs to be put into thinking through the process of how a youth policy is derived which people from many walks of life are committed to implementing. What has now become an adage, often postulated and seldom acted on, that the best policies are those that engage in policy development those who must be involved in policy implementation, is applicable here. In The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education-Work Policy by Willard Wirtz and the National Manpower Institute, it is argued that, in the youth policy area, not only is attention to the process of gaining agreement imperative but, by and large, that it is at the local community level that the greatest need and prospects for doing so occur. The approach commended by Willard Wirtz is to develop Community Education-Work Councils which bring together those community constituencies and leaderships (educators, businessmen, labor union representatives, youth service agency personnel, youth, government representatives) most essential for and capable of unlocking community resources and opportunities beneficial for youth's development and enlightenment. This suggestion of creating such community youth policy forums, which are concerned as much with working out the processes of community collaboration as with programs, have captured the attention of the Federal Interagency Task Force on Education and Work and particularly the Department of Labor. A 15-25 community consortium of Community Education-Work Councils is now being established. Hopefully,

such a developmental effort will provide instructive insight into how communities can work together on behalf of youth rather than at cross purposes. In these communities the commitment to talking and working through some of the different youth issues mentioned earlier will be tested.

Even if there is agreement that it is in communities that critical youth issues must be addressed and opportunities developed, nevertheless, it is naive to assume that local commitment will win out in the face of federal and state guidelines, in the face of national and state laws and regulations and in the face of national attitudes and practices which run counter to these developments.

In the long run the most promising local development will wither or will be isolated if not nurtured by channels to the outside world. For example, a local facility of a major multinational corporation may have the independence to participate in local youth policy development and implementation but is unlikely to do so on a sustained basis unless encouragement is provided from corporate headquarters. Local prime sponsors probably can make available Title I CETA resources to support more comprehensive and coordinated youth development activities but this probably won't happen very often either unless federal guidelines are clarified which permit and encourage broader approaches.

With respect to youth probably more than with any other population subgroup the attitudes, policies and practices of federal and state governments are most schizophrenic. On the one hand, the government has stayed away from the development of comprehensive youth policy and programming, in part, because "youth development" is one of the responsibilities which most clearly, in our federal system, rests with local communities. On the other hand, federal

and state governments have intervened to provide support for special youth services and programs where it has proved obvious that communities have not been able or willing to develop them on their own. The results, not surprisingly, are multiple youth programs and services which operate in relative isolation from (indeed in some cases in opposition to) one another which focus usually on the most intransigent and remedial of youth problems.

Such circumstances create an environment which is frustrating to those engaged in providing youth services because they have opportunity to relate to young people only after critical problems, such as drug and alcohol abuse or delinquent behavior, emerge. Rather than being partners in a common endeavor to help all youth, a bifurcation emerges where federal and state resources, too often, enter a community to support, train, provide services to only the "failures" and local resources and energies support the schools and community colleges, the Boy Scouts and Junior Achievement, etc., activities which are, by and large, seen as preventative in nature. This, of course, affects our perceptions of various levels of government...and, in particular, underscores many people's negative impressions of the role of the federal government in their individual and community lives. The circumstances also contribute to an environment which lead federal and state leaders to a conclusion that additional resources for the same or more programs would be counter productive; and, also, leads to increasing skepticism on the part of community leaders as to whether federal or state governments have either an interest in or capability of being helpful to youth on any terms that community members would consider consistence with local beliefs and priorities. As things are working now there are fewer and fewer opportunities for different levels of government to reconcile their differences of perspective. Revenue-sharing programs cut the federal government

out of decision-making on a wide range of issues and Supreme Court decisions and legislation and program guidelines concerning sich matters in busing, equal employment oppotunities, youth employment programs, curriculun development, etc., tend to leave little room for local accommodation.

Hopefully, youth policy development would not reinforce but would rather provide opportunities to alleviate some of these problems. Federal policy developed in the absence of infusion of the experience of interacting with communities is likely to become all the more irrelevant. The real issue is not whether the federal government can or will be involved but rather on what terms. For example, the federal government could encourage communities to develop local youth policy by encouraging development of such instrumentalities as Community Education-Work Councils. It can also reward the results of such local cooperation and planning by delivering resources to those communities which have demonstrated a commitment to and capability of implementing those policies.

It is imperative that both the process and product sides of the problem be worked on. Cooperation needs to be developed locally, as well as nationally, but that isn't likely to be either attainable or sustainable unless the products of that local effort are rewarded in ways which, in significant measure, are satisfactory to communities. For example, it is difficult to stimulate local cooperative interest around issues of youth's transition from school to work when there are so few opportunities out there in the community...not only for youth but for adults as well...to engage themselves in productive activites. It is reasonable to expect that communities do more than they have in the past by way of opening up work or service opportunities for youth. It is also reasonable to expect that communities do much more by way of creating a local environment which is conducive to youth taking advantage of these

opportunities. But, it is simply a fact that, in the main, economic and employment issues are ones which must be addressed by federal policy and legislation. Local actions can't turn around the national employment situation; and, until the federal government demonstrates higher priority concern in particular about youth problems of gaining access to the adult world it will be difficult to generate an atmosphere locally that will be more capable of dealing with youth interests and problems in some more comprehensive manner. But, unless the federal government finds ways of drawing on local experiences and interests encouraging locally designed initiatives that federal commitment can lead simply to the creation of new programs which are as isolated as the old ones or to further entrenchment of relationships that aren't working now.

In sum, new processes of cooperation at the local level, which bring together important constituencies and interests around issues of youth development need to be worked on. At the same time it is essential that federal and state levels demonstrate higher priority concern and commitment toward youth development problems by rewarding those communities who have made the commitment to comprehensive youth development planning and implementation.

In thinking through what kinds of financial incentives need to be generated to support comprehensive youth policy comparable processes of cooperation at state and federal levels need to be worked out to those at local levels. Certainly the fractionalization of programs and services which relate to youth are a reflection, in part, of the organization of federal and state bureaucracies. Re-organization is called for which brings together in a single agency the efforts relating to youth development which now are scattered throughout the bureaucracy. Some people have argued for breaking education off from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and folding into it the relevant activities from the Departments of Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Justice, etc., creating a separate Department of Education. What would be more consistent with the line of argument of this paper would be the creation of a major division

concerned with Youth Development within a larger Department of Human Resources Development.

Realism about the possibilities for major re-organization necessitates the conclusion that the objective is laudable but perhaps not completely achievable. Most important, however, is the elevation of youth development as a major national concern. In this regard, it would be helpful to create major public forums where youth issues can be discussed and policy formulated. Several carefully designed White House Conferences on Youth, which provide opportunities for various constituencies to express their concern about and interest in youth would seem worthwhile. The establishment of a Youth Commission could be a product of these conferences charged with responsibility for encouraging that and determining whether the various recommendations are being carried out.

Of course more meetings and more talk is not the answer. But, further action steps can develop from these local and national forums.

Attempting to anticipate what suggestions might emerge from these discussions is risky business; nevertheless, the following is an attempt at doing so.

First, there is need for implementation of a major Full Employment Bill which would improve the employment environment for adults and youth alike. If the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill can be resurrected in the 95th Congress and passed that would represent substantial progress. Hopefully, the youth portion of such a piece of legislation would recognize that, in many dimensions, youth employment and unemployment problems differ from those of adults. Solutions therefore need to be carefully adapted to a different range of youth employment. For example, hopefully the objective of such a program would not simply be more jobs but also encourage attention to the issue of the developmental quality of those work situations. Additionally, such an effort could encourage locally

designed job creation initiatives where new types of work stations for youth might evolve. Incentives could be provided employers and unions to participate in such an effort. In general, considerable flexibility ought to be permitted in terms of the particular types of employment opportunities supported and youth served.

Second, there needs to be a major federal initiative which, in the main, supports locally developed community service opportunities for youth. Maximum flexibility, again, should be retained in the use of these resources. But, disbursement of resources, could be conditional upon communities demonstrating that their plans emerge from a local decision-making process that has engaged a cross-section of community interests, including those of youth. Such an initiative could be begun on a demonstration-scale where communities had to compete for scarce resources or be developed on a national scale.

Beyond support for community service opportunities there is need for the expansion of service programs which afford some youth the opportunity to get outside of their local community environments to work in other settings. Programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps, VISTA, the Peace Corps are cases in point. Perhaps, some sort of "service-exchange" arrangement could be worked out among some communities which would provide youth with opportunities to live and serve in community settings other than their own.

Third, it is important that the commitment be maintained to providing youth with opportunities to pursue education beyond high school. Extension of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program to include a wider segment of the American population is critical. This is particularly the case in these days of rapidly escalating costs of education participation. Many of the children of middle and working class families will find the educational option slipping away from them if their financial needs aren't addressed.

Beyond this, more opportunities are needed which permit youth to pay for their own education. The expansion of youth employment and community service initiatives suggested earlier will contribute greatly to this objective. This assumes, however, that attitudes and practices which have reinforced a "lock-step" pattern of educational attendance will continue to change so that a young person who "stops-out" of school for work or service for a period of time will not be punished for doing so by policies which make it difficult to get back into education.

At the same time quality experiential education efforts need to be encouraged. Cooperative education, experience-based career education and various other types of initiatives, such as are represented by the Urban Corps, the Society for Field Experience Education and the National Center for Public Service Internship, could benefit from substantially expanded support from federal and state governments.

In not all of these instances will or should pay be the critical issue. It will, be critical in many cases. There ought to be consideration, however, however, of a variety of ways in which youth can be rewarded for participation in experiential programs. Provisions of academic credit is one form of reward. Wages, of course, are another. There also might be consideration of some sort of voucher arrangement where, for services or work performed, an entitlement was granted which could be used at some future time, to pay for education or perhaps even other benefits (such as basic equipment or materials to enter employment). This suggestion is a slight twist on the Community Service Fellowship notion recommended by Action and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. In that proposal, out of school youth would be rewarded for their community service by being provided educational entitlements much as Veterans have been entitled to educational benefits under the G.I. Bill. The suggestion

here is that that notion be extended to include youth still in school, to include private as well as public sector opportunities and to cover a wider range of benefits than just education. The added benefit here is that this option would be extended to secondary school youth who could be earning educational or other entitlements while being exposed to an experiential learning situation.

Perhaps the least successful of those efforts which enable youth to earn while they learn is the College Work-Study Program. In too many instances young people are provided simply make-work assignments of benefit to neither the student nor the college. Perhaps some of these resources ought to be shifted into the BEOG or other student aid or loan categories. Where the work is simply an excuse for an income transfer and is not particularly rewarding to student or institution it would be the wiser course to simply transfer the income through grant, scholarship or loan programs. At the same time, encouragement can be provided administrators of College Work-Study Programs to develop work situations which do a better job of matching student interests and institutional needs. This can be done first by highlighting the experiential value of a work-study placement in the program objectives and in the Work-Study guidelines and, second, by permitting resources to be spent on buying administrative services which help students in on-campus or off-campus jobs.

In combination, (i) the youth portion of a Full-Employment Bill, (ii) new youth service initiatives and (iii) the continued commitment to educational opportunities could add up to a National Youth Opportunities Initiative which could guarantee all youth, between the ages of 16 and 21, with choices from among an expanding range of education, work and service opportunities.

We are now a long way away from being able to extend to our youth such a guarantee. In some of our central cities, the majority of 18-20 year old youth are out-of-school, out-of-work and not in service. The costs of rectifying this situation, if it can be, will be high. The costs of failing to try are unconscionably higher. Failure to try, guarantees only that many young people will simply be locked-out of participation in our society at a very vital time in their lives and that many others, who, in fairness, must be considered the lucky ones, have been locked into educational participation beyond a time when they can personally benefit from it because of the lack of other recognized options in work and in service.